

Do not trim

gp

10c

Fermin Peinado

Professor of the University of Oriente, Cuba

LIBRARY
USE ONLY

BEWARE, YANKEE

THE REVOLUTION IN CUBA

- Are certain American writers trying to whitewash the Cuban Revolution? A Cuban University Professor of Political Science proves that it still stains Red.

Gift of Dolores Tidwell

The views in Cuban events held by some American
magazines devoted to politics or a high
intellectual plane are numerous. Such
views, sometimes favorable of the Cuban
revolution, are often presented in a
biased manner.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTERS

ONE:	Note on Mr. Kyle Haselden's article "Cuba's Revolution: Yes and No"	4
TWO:	Note on Mr. Norman A. Bailey's article "Latin America since the War"	6
THREE:	Reply to Mr. Hulsey's article "The Cuban Revolution: Its Impact on American Foreign Policy"	9
FOUR:	Reply to Mr. Samuel Shapiro's article "Cuba: A Dissenting Report"	14
FIVE:	Reply to Mr. C. Wright Mills' chapter of "Listen, Yankee" reprinted in Harper's Magazine	27
APPENDIX:	Statement of the Faculty and Students of the University of Oriente	45

Gift of Dolores Tidwell

Re-production of this Book is Permitted

108379

INTRODUCTION

LIBRARY
RSITY OF TEXAS
ISTIN TEXAS

The views on Cuban events held by some American magazines devoted to international affairs or on a high intellectual plane are very frequently erroneous. Such views sometimes cover specific aspects of the Cuban situation and others arise out of the application to Cuba of general theories offered as to social, political and economic conditions in Latin America or, more broadly, in the so-called "underdeveloped countries." For the greater enlightenment of American university students, it is advisable to correct those misinterpretations of Cuban events.

length, in brief response to five reports by distinguished Americans on the Cuban situation, each dealing with the dictatorial and communistic nature of Dr. Fidel Castro's regime.

The confusion we have encountered among many American university scholars and their erroneous approach to Cuban problems in particular and to Latin American problems in general have convinced us of the need to systematically disseminate information as thoroughly as possible. For the moment such a task is not possible for us. Lack of means, documentation and time demands that such task be left for some time in the future. But that does not prevent us from attempting, as of now and even without the strictly necessary working facilities, to clear up misstatements made by persons with the prestige of university chairs.

The importance of the situation in Cuba, where internal communism has managed to set up a satellite Government at the very gates to the United States, does not reside only with the military danger it undoubtedly implies to American security. It also means the acquisition by communism of an excellent political beachhead for an attack in depth on Latin America institutions. It also serves as tangible proof that the communist minority in the guise of 'nationalist leftwingism,' in order to deceive the noncommunist majorities, can take over a country situated in the heart of the West, in the very center of the "Western sphere of influence," against the will of its inhabitants, and through the use of Soviet arms, attempt to establish itself permanently.

Cuba cannot be lost to freedom because that would mean the decline of freedom throughout the world. We are aware of the fact that the United States is today the great bastion of free men regardless of the defects in its social economic and political structure and the errors historically attributable to that country. Its overall position is highly positive and, as compared to the somber Soviet record, there is not the slightest doubt as to the choice offered.

We feel the duty of the University professor to defend the permanent value of the "American proposition": "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. That among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness". These ideals are still today as revolutionary as they were in 1776. And not only are they the patrimony of the citizens of the United States, but also, of all Latin Americans, and of all the free citizens of the world.

States is being made from within through cunning infiltration and the systematic shaping of mind and conscience. Something that surprises us as foreigners in the United States is to encounter a widespread "international guilt complex" among Americans. The very substantial communist propaganda, so superior to the virtually nonexistent American propaganda, has been successful in convincing the Americans themselves that they are sinful. In the November issue of Reader's Digest, General Rómulo pointed out that whereas the cancellation of President Eisenhower's trip to Tokyo, prevented by the action of a communist-led minority, received prominent play in all of the world's press and was given banner headlines for days in the "capitalist" and "imperialist" press of the United States and its new agencies, the President's visit to Manila and the extraordinary reception offered in the former possession warranted little attention.

President Kennedy invites us to exert our greatest effort and to sacrifice ourselves in the struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, sickness and war. The men who fight against the Communist tyranny in Cuba accept this invitation with great enthusiasm. The Cuban battle marks the moment when the free World starts fighting against communist tyrannies. The values expressed in the Declaration of 1776 are still fruitfull, because they represent "the eternal in man". The Soviet Revolution, on the contrary, was outdated from the beginning. In this "adventure of liberty", as Croce calls History, there is no place for permanent dictatorship. In the face of a free World conscious of its weaknesses, but also of its strength, willing to fight in every order, with an energetic and capable leadership, communist totalitarianism is doomed to disappear.

The duty of all free men toward the American people is to help inform them of the truth by combatting the errors which, sometimes in good faith and other times deliberately, are disseminated in the United States.

To contribute in our own modest way toward correcting faulty information, we publish these articles.

Miami, December, 1960

The articles that follow and the previous introduction were written in December 1960. Since then, a new Administration headed by John F. Kennedy has taken over the destinies of the American nation. President Kennedy's splendid inaugural address has kindled the hopes of those men—all over the world—who love freedom. A young leader, truly progressive—not a false "progressive" as those intellectuals who under a modern disguise want to recede to the Pharaoh's times—demands our supreme effort in the defense of freedom. Everyone in its field must

CHAPTER ONE

10

In an article published in the December 7, 1960 issue of "The Christian Century" by Kyle Haselden, under the title "Cuba's Revolution: Yes and No," it is stated that Cubans, having been betrayed many times at the polls, do not consider elections a necessary condition for democracy. That assertion is wrong. In the United States the opinion is prevalent in many quarters, on the other hand, that conditions required for a sound democracy do not exist in most of the countries of Latin America where dictatorships therefore constitute a sound form of Government. Without going into a discussion of the validity of the general theme regarding the "necessity" for strong or dictatorial Governments at given moments in the supposed advance of the peoples of the world toward democracy, in the Cuban case past history and recent events contradict same.

Few people have had such an acute sense as the Cubans of the need for representative institutions and elections for the practice of democracy and the safeguarding of human rights. The Cuban wars of independence against the colonial Government of Spain during the 19th century were always launched with Constituent Assemblies in which representatives of the Cuban insurrectionists drafted the fundamental charter of the Republic of Cuba in arms. And always, despite wartime conditions, a Legislative Power was created separate from the Executive Power and military and civil authority were kept divided to prevent the dictatorial concentration of powers, with the threat that might imply against individual liberties and rights.

The history of republican Cuba has followed the same path. The revolution of 1933 against the dictatorship of President Machado occurred after constitutional violations by the dictator and the suppression of free elections. The revolutionary process culminated with the fall of the tyrant and the Constituent Assembly of 1939, following the first dictatorial period of Fulgencio Batista. In 1939 a series of free elections was started which lasted until the coup d'état of March 10, 1952. During that period of time Cubans displeased with the handling of public affairs by popularly elected leaders had the means of removing them by the formation of political parties and participa-

It is neither historically nor currently true that the majority of Cubans do not consider elections as a necessary basis for democracy. Rather, from the very beginning of our national history, we have regarded them as fundamental. In fact, the revolution against Batista was fought with a view to restoring the violated Constitution of 1940 and to convening elections within a term of not more than 18 months. Fidel Castro felt compelled to go on talking about elections during the first months of his Government in consideration of popular pressure toward that end, and only when he felt he had sufficient military strength to impose his will, monopolizing propaganda and communication media, did he condemn elections.

Consistent with the history of Cuba and the desires of its people, the present revolution against the dictatorship of Fidel Castro seeks restoration of the 1940 Constitution and calling of elections within 18 months.

Specifically, when the coup d'état occurred, the principal opposition party, the Cuban People's Party (Orodoxos) was preparing to run candidates for the elections of June of that year to win power. The coup d'état was brought off by a candidate without electoral strength, General Batista, who had no recourse but military force to attain power.

CHAPTER TWO

We found a second extremely widespread error in an article by Norman A. Bailey entitled "Latin America Since the War," which appeared in the "Journal of International Affairs," No. 2, 1960.

According to Bailey, communism is attractive to underdeveloped countries by reason of the "undeniable fact" that it is a means of rapid economic growth. When "respectable" liberal Governments fail to bring about the development of underdeveloped economies, we are told, these peoples lean toward the communist means of development, notwithstanding the dictatorship that implies.

Leaving aside the general statement to the effect that the rapid growth of communist economies is an "undeniable fact," event though we think it is a proven fact that other economies have developed in the same period of time more intensively than communist ones without employing dictatorial methods, let us examine the Cuban situation.

In the first place, the concept of "underdevelopment" cannot be applied equally to every country designated as "underdeveloped" (with all of the inaccuracy and polemic nature of that term). Cuba was, prior to Batista's coup d'état, a country undergoing development. Its wealth was increasing from year to year. New industries were being established. The livestock industry had attained maturity and constituted an impressive source of wealth. Mining was developing at a rapid pace. And at the time of the treacherous coup of March 10, 1952, the most revolutionary desire of Cubans was to have an "honest" government. Public pressure for integrity had prompted the Government of President Carlos Prio Socarrás to entrust to honest men the clean-up of two major Departments, Education and Treasury. And in the abortive elections of 1952 the presidential candidate of the Cuban Revolutionary Party (Auténticos), the Government party, was an honest man, Engineer Hevia; the principal opposition party candidate, Professor Agramonte, was also an honest man.

Furthermore, all Cubans, except for the Communist Party minority, accepted the 1940 Constitution and a Cuban economic and social structure based on free enterprise. The social and economic reforms desired were advocated on constitutional foundations. Mere examination of the

literature on the subject prior to March 10 can convince Mr. Bailey that the Cuban people did not feel attracted to communism as a means of achieving rapid economic development.

Of course, some intellectuals on wrong philosophical basis, in both Cuba and the United States, comparing economic systems in their libraries, do feel attracted by the "wonderful achievements" of communist totalitarian economies. But that hidden feeling of a minority cannot be used by Mr. Bailey as a basis for arguing that such attraction exists among the peoples of Latin America or of Cuba, in particular. The intellectual who believes that things should be a certain way often feels inclined to think that everyone sees those things as he does. The fact is that practically no one in Cuba ever thought or spoke, prior to the triumph of Fidel Castro, of the need for a communist, statist or, more discretely, "socialist" economy to promote the economic development of Cuba.

II

Both Mr. Bailey and Mr. Haselden, in the article on which we commented previously, refer to the great accomplishments of the Castro Government with regard to school construction, diversification of agriculture, public health, etc. Mr. Bailey further points to the absence of corruption.

The picture is highly inaccurate. The State is virtually the sole builder, but constructs much less than was previously constructed in Cuba. It converts old barracks into schools, but construct new and better barracks and militarizes children from kindergarten on up. It has not diversified but has ruined agriculture. There is much talk about industrialization, but nothing has been done in two years, while previous Governments, including even Batista's dictatorship, constantly promoted the establishment of new industries. As for absence of corruption, the accuracy of that statement depends upon what is meant by corruption. In a constitutional democratic regime the functionary who makes other than legal use of public funds is an embezzler. But that is what Fidel and his officials do every day, for they handle public funds like personal assets. Fidel and his officials also have available the best Cuban mansions, hotels, helicopters, yachts, warships and splendid aircraft, like the Britannias of "Com-

CHAPTER THREE

pañía Cubana de Aviación." Of course, when all of those things are enjoyed and done "in the name of the Revolution," they are "moral," in accordance with Lenin's classic definition that what serves the Revolution is moral. When Fidel Castro deposits millions of dollars in foreign banks in his own name and in the name of his cronies, it is understood that they are to be used for the benefit of the Revolution if his dictatorship should some day be overthrown in Cuba or to buy arms necessary "for defense of the Revolution" more discretely. But an examination of the economic situation before and during "Castro-ism" should be covered by a separate study.

III

Mr. Bailey is of the opinion that if Fidel should disappear from the revolutionary scene, the Government would fall into the hands of Raúl Castro and Ché Guevara and would lean more to the left. We do not see how the Cuban Government can lean more to the left than it does at present. The degree of leftwingism should not be confused with its present stage of communization. Russia is advancing officially from socialism to communism. Cuba, on the other hand, is on the march toward socialism. The stages are therefore different. But the rapidity of socialization of the Cuban economy has no parallel in history. Neither Russia nor China nor the countries of Eastern Europe have gone so fast. We do not believe that Ché and Raúl can accelerate the process even more. Hence, they cannot be more leftist than Fidel.

On the other hand, the basis of power in Cuba is Fidel Castro. Once Fidel disappears, the rest of the communist Government would not last two weeks. The Cuban people is not communist. The colossal deceit of the extraordinary actor that Fidel undoubtedly is was necessary for almost every Cuban to have been mistaken. Little by little they have been awakening. Today perhaps 20% of the Cuban population is Fidelista. Without Fidel, that 20% would disappear. The communist ranks existing before and those created in the last two years under official protection are not sufficiently numerous. The International Brigade operating in Cuba is not, in spite of its excellent weapons, big enough to subject the Cubans. It is therefore incorrect to state that the disappearance of Fidel from the Cuban political scene could be harmful.

Another article containing extraordinary errors is entitled "The Cuban Revolution: Its Impact on American Foreign Policy." The author is Raymond H. Hulsey and the article appeared in the same issue of the *Journal of International Affairs*, which he co-publishes.

Mr. Hulsey refers to the view of the well-known news-

paperman, Herbert Matthews, to which he subscribes and on which he expands, that American public opinion has been informed of the unfavorable aspects of Dr. Castro's communist regime and not of the favorable ones. This is not true. In the first place, let us recall that every communist movement benefits from previous propaganda disseminated in favor of other communist regimes. A propaganda machine so well constructed and operating uninterruptedly for more than forty years, like that of international communism, is an exceptional asset.

Mr. Hulsey cannot be unaware of the fact that from the moment of triumph until well into 1959 Dr. Castro enjoyed a propaganda monopoly. No facts were known other than those disseminated by him. In Cuba press, radio and television were willing to propagandize a regime they believed to be noncommunist. Internationally, innumerable leftist intellectuals, like the well-known Jean Paul Sartre, joined the abundant ranks of official propagandists. North and South American journalists, as well as Europeans, were invited to visit the country and hear and see what the regime wished to show them. Innumerable committees of eminent Cubans, university professors, intellectuals, businessmen, were used from the outset for Castro's propaganda in order to show the world that "he was not communist."

An intellectual of such renown and so averse to communism as Jorge Mañach defended the noncommunist character of Castro's regime in 1959 before other more aware illustrious figures of the Committee for Cultural Freedom in Paris. Catholic associations and religious publications in Cuba also defended the regime throughout most of 1959 and the most important Catholic review, "La Quincena," did so until the middle of 1960. At the outset Castro established a news agency serving interna-

tional communism and his regime, "Prensa Latina," having close ties with TASS and other communist agencies. "Non-communist" professors and intellectuals were named Ambassadors to demonstrate to intellectuals in the countries where they were stationed that the Cuban regime "was not communist." It is therefore extraordinary to read Mr. Hulsey's contention that in the United States Castro has not been portrayed as a "noncommunist" idealist.

It is well to recall that in communist countries, from Russia on down, the only news is official news. This means that only a partial view of events is systematically presented, which impedes peaceful coexistence. "Progressive" intellectuals of the West ought to organize a vast campaign designed to allow news to circulate freely in the countries of the "socialist" world and opinions to be freely expressed and written. In that way they would truly work for peace. But here in the United States nothing prevents communist publications and writers from stating what they think. In addition to the regular communist and pro-communist organizations, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was set up in the United States, devoted to systematically presenting Castro's side under the modest guise of "scientific objectivity." I do not believe that Mr. Hulsey doubts the importance of the New York Times and cannot be unaware of the fact that Mr. Matthews and the New York Times have been more than understanding with the Castro regime, even at the expense of the truth.

II

The opinion he offers to the effect that if the communist Government of Cuba should ask the United States to abandon the Guantánamo naval base, the Americans ought to abandon it, because this would serve as excellent propaganda, is astonishing. American prestige has already suffered tremendously through the presence of a communist Government in Cuba and every day that transpires with that Government still in existence means a further decline in American prestige throughout the world. But abandonment of the Guantánamo base would mean a defeat of overwhelming proportions. History should have taught the Americans by now that the great victories of Russia over the United States have not been achieved on the battlefield, but in diplomatic negotiations. With Soviet victories irresponsibly facilitated by many intellectual

publications in this country and university professors holding confused views on world events, Russia has normally won out in the "cold war." The opinions of some American intellectuals interest us, because they might influence public opinion in their country and State Department policy. Those opinions frequently entail untold sufferings for peoples subject to the Soviet yoke: Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, East Germans, Albanians, Lithuanians, Chinese, Koreans and many other. And now the Cubans. But those offering such opinions lack the slightest sense of human sympathy and never take into account the present very real sufferings of peoples living under the heel of Soviet imperialism.

III

Mr. Hulsey reproduces a survey from Bohemia Magazine of June 1960 in which it is "scientifically" affirmed that 87.84% of the population is with Castro and 94% of the peasants. Is Mr. Hulsey unaware of the fact that the owner and publisher of Bohemia Magazine and the chief editors had to go into exile after seeking refuge in foreign embassies and that Bohemia Libre is now published in New York? Doesn't he know that a dictatorial regime in which there is no free publication, in which all of the professional associations have been taken over by Government militia, in which the universities have lost their autonomy with professors and students expelled by the hundreds, in which the labor leadership has been changed by Government order and in which the peasant leadership is imprisoned has no difficulty in fabricating a survey? The best survey of popularity of the Castro regime would be afforded by permitting free expression; respecting human rights that are now being violated, releasing the workers, peasants, students, professors, professional men and other Cubans who fill the political prisons, permitting the organization of political parties, aside from the only existing one which is the Popular Socialist Party (Communist), and calling elections. A regime with the popularity that Mr. Hulsey claims Castro has should not fear the free opinion expressed in the form of elections. But it does fear them. Why, Mr. Hulsey?

arm in arm and allied with Fidel (who ^{A H U N T E R} ~~KNOW EACH~~ well) to realize who Arbenz was.

Mr. Hulsey feels that President Eisenhower's Administration shoud have helped the Castro regime and did not do so and that accounts for the anti-Americanism of the Cuban communists. It is erroneous. At no time did the regime really want American aid. The anti-American propaganda campaign started in the Sierra. We cannot forget the kidnap of American citizens, some of whom were helping Castro, by order of the rebel commander.

Anti-Americanism was evident from the start with the persecution of anticomunism. In the "Second Front of Frank País" anticomunist leaders like Major Nino Diaz were taken prisoner and barely escaped death. Anticomunist leaders were always placed in dangerous positions to die, like Frank País in Santiago de Cuba. From the Sierra the stage was set for anti-American propaganda and "counterrevolutionary" suspicions were hurled against "noncommunists." And in January 1959 official communist indoctrination courses were deliberately started with mimeographed textbooks, placing emphasis on anti-Yankeeism. The United States could do nothing to win over a regime that had no other raison d'être but to serve as an instrument of the Soviet Union. Anyone who says otherwise does not know what he is talking about.

V

It is true that Castro regime started off with extraordinary popularity in Latin America, just as it did in Cuba. But it is also true that this initial popularity has been losing ground, though at a slower pace than in Cuba, for it is easier to be deceived about distant events. The Chilean or Columbia University professor, who have not lived through the Cuban tragedy are waking up to the truth later than we Cubans who have undergone personal sufferings. There are still those who regard the case of Arbenz in Guatemala as a simple example of American imperialist intervention against a popular democratic Government respectful of human rights. Perhaps Mr. Hulsey also feels that way. That is how communist propaganda painted the picture. But those who lived through the events in Guatemala know the truth. Cubans who are naturally "men of the Left" needed to see Arbenz

in my opinion, Castro is not a Communist in the sense that he has a Party card or is even subservient to Kremlin orders. He is a man deeply touched by the ignorance, squalor and poverty in which the great majority of the people he loves so deeply has had to live. He sacrificed his very comfortable position in Cuban society and devoted his life to the ouster of the man who seemed responsible for these conditions. Once, in power he then turned against the system that seemed responsible for the misery of the Cuban people. That the system he is substituting in its place is more similar to that of Red China or Soviet Russia's is testimony to the success the Communist nations have had in presenting themselves as examples of rapid industrialization and to the failure of Capitalism to give the majority of Cubans anything more than a dirt floor and outdoor privy and a poor diet."

The portrait is inaccurate. Fidel Castro belonged to groups of university "gangsters" in his student days, having been a member of the Revolutionary Insurrectionist Union. In the adventure at Cayo Confites against Dictator Trujillo, he was a subordinate of the notorious Rolando Masferrer, former communist and latter a supporter of Dictator Batista. He took part in the famous "bogotazo" (Bogota riots of 1948) hand in hand with the Communist Party. His social position, for reasons I do not feel it necessary to mention, "was not good." Because Castro was little known and Dictator Batista was wholly repudiated, after Castro came into the public limelight at the time of the attack on Moncada Barracks in 1953, his shady background did not prevent his deification by the Cuban people. But at this stage of history, the portrait of Fidel Castro painted by a foreign scholar like Mr. Hulsey is incomprehensible. It can only be regarded as a result of "wishful thinking."

CHAPTER FOUR

One of Castro's propagandists, Mr. Samuel Shapiro, Assistant Professor of History at Michigan State University, specialist in Latin American affairs, has written two articles published in *The New Republic*, after having been a guest of Cuba for one month. The first article is entitled "Cuba: A Dissenting Report" and the other is "Castro and His Critics."

To those who know the truth about the Cuban situation, Mr. Shapiro's articles do not merit a reply. They are spiced with the commonplaces of Cuban communist propaganda, the manifest falsehood of which is obvious to any Cuban. But the fact is that most of Mr. Shapiro's readers are not well acquainted with the Cuban situation, for which reason it is easy to mislead them. Furthermore, Mr. Shapiro writes ably, sometimes hinting at certain conclusions that he does not dare to express clearly and other times employing the standard method of communist and pro-communist professors, that of half-truths. As for style, he livens up his report with anecdotes and references to "concrete examples." We have therefore decided to present a brief rebuttal of his arguments.

II

The American Shapiro begins by demonstrating how "just and reasonable" is Castro's "anti-Americanism" and seeks to regard all of the negative aspects of Cuban communist totalitarianism in that light. He paints a biased picture of Cuban history in the tradition of that well-known fellow traveler, Carleton Beals, portraying Fidel Castro as a sort of Robin Hood, thus following up the previous newspaper propaganda started by Herbert Matthews of the *New York Times* during the era of Dictator Batista. He describes Batista's troops as "U.S.-trained" and the bombardments as having been made by "U.S.-built aircraft", without mentioning the fact that the United States was the principal base for the revolution against Batista. He repeats Fidel's "catch phrase" as to the 20,000 killed by Batista. He lays emphasis on the aerial bombardments made with "American bombs." But

he says nothing about the fact that at the famous trial of Batista's aviators early in 1959, a tribunal of Fidel Castro's men, which had previously sentenced to death many persons judged guilty and meriting that penalty, exonerated those fliers, among other reasons, because the public prosecutors were unable to prove even 5 deaths in innumerable bombing missions. That decision gave rise to one of the most famous and earliest explosions of rage of dictator Castro, who from Havana cast aspersions on the Tribunal of Santiago de Cuba, this time appointing a kangaroo court, before which Defense Minister Major Martínez Sánchez accused the defense attorneys, employing the thesis, learned from his Soviet professors, that the only role of defense attorneys "in a revolutionary regime" was to ask for clemency, but never to argue that the government's charges could be unfounded. He "valiantly" offered this extraordinary thesis with an armed multitude behind him, and only the courage of the defense attorneys and, in particular, of Dr. Carlos Peña Jústiz, Professor of the School of Law of Universidad de Oriente, was able to prevent death sentences asked by Fidel from going through. On completion of the trial, with sentences of 30 years imprisonment, of the three members of the previous tribunal which had exonerated the fliers, the Presiding Justice, Major Félix Peña, died mysteriously, Major Michel is now in exile, fighting dictator Castro, and defense attorney, Dr. Peña Justiz, was expelled from his university chair and from his chair in the School of Commerce, under pressure from Major Castro.

III

As a sample of Mr. Shapiro's system of innuendoes, let us note he writes that Guevara (who, of course, is not a communist, as far as Mr. Shapiro is concerned) held "a minor post in the Arbenz Government in Guatemala, when a rebellion backed by the C.I.A. overthrew the regime." Mr. Shapiro does not tell the reader that the University of Guatemala and the Guatemalan people were against Arbenz because of the evermore obvious communist control of his Government, that that Government tortured, killed and violated the rights of man, that Arbenz, who became President after the assassination of Colonel Arana, is a decided ally of the communist party, guest of Prague yesterday and Castro's guest today, and that the Guatemalan

army, which had overthrown dictator Ubico and supported President Arévalo, demanded Arbenz' resignation. The only thing Mr. Shapiro does is to emphasize facts that serve to foment anti-Americanism. As for the executions without trial that Mr. Shapiro ignores, let us again recall that Sr. Raúl Castro shot down without trial more than 70 men in Santiago de Cuba. This is without counting a great number of cases about which we Cubans are learning as *Fidelista* leaders of importance defect.

V

As far as the Cuban Agrarian Reform Act is concerned, it can only be taken seriously abroad. The writer of the present article, Professor of the School of Law of Universidad de Oriente, made a proposal, which was accepted by his fellow faculty members in January 1959, to call a National Forum on Agrarian Reform, which would be attended by every possible interested party and organization, including, of course, the Government through the ministerial departments concerned. The contents of the proposal were carefully studied. When Mr. Castro came to the University in February, the Secretary, Dr. Echemendía, informed him of the project. Castro's comment was: "What do they want to do, oppose me?" The alarmed Secretary apologized and explained to him the contents of the proposal, to which Castro replied: "Good, but since what you want is what I want, the best thing to do is wait for me to enact the law and when it is published, you can comment on it." Everything indicated that the law was not going to include anything beyond what Fidel wanted. And this was indeed the case.

As for the equity of the Act, one example can be given. Latifundium is defined as ownership of more than 1000 acres, controlled not only by individuals, but also by companies and joint owners. Now, in Cuba family ties are very close, especially in the Cuban countryside. Hence, a large number of rural land-owning families held as much as 1150, 1300 and 1650 acres. Of course, individual land-owners are not involved, but rather families which often included great grandparents and great grandchildren, so that each adult owned barely 33 acres. Nevertheless, the law regards them as latifundists and expropriates their property. That law, which seems designed to combine the properties of small farmers in large estates that are

The portrait painted by Mr. Shapiro of his friend, the "Dictator" of INRA (National Institute of Agrarian Reform), "Professor" Núñez Jiménez, is highly inaccurate. Dr. Núñez Jiménez has no "phenomenal" nor even "fair" knowledge of agrarian reforms and natural resources. And even though he was a geography professor, he knows very little about it. His extremely mediocre book on geography is full of major errors, such as having the Central Highway pass through San Luis, something which any bus driver knows is untrue. The correct parts were copied from an excellent geography book by Dr. Levi Marrero, also a fellow traveler, but a competent man who knows his subject.

VI

The economic horrors perpetrated by INRA cannot be enumerated here. The livestock industry, one of the great sources of national wealth, has been destroyed, to the extent that Cuba is now importing cattle. This does not prevent the handsome propaganda review of INRA from publishing the photograph of a 6-year-old specimen as an example of success in livestock breeding under an agrarian reform act that is barely one year old. Of 400,000 hundredweights of coffee which should have been exported last year, only 40,000 were exported. Corn was imported, in spite of the plantings of INRA. In Cuba, where there was never a shortage of chicken, it is prohibited to sell it on Wednesdays. And it is very often not to be found on other days. There is a food shortage. In other words, Cuba has gone back many years in its economy, thanks to INRA.

VII

Shapiro claims that the men of INRA are youths "without ideology". This is a profound error. The head of the sugar cane cooperatives, Santos Ríos, for example, is a communist with 25 years in the Party. The list of communists in INRA is long and publications like *Bohemia Libre* can furnish same to Mr. Shapiro. The fact is that, because of his little contact with communists, Mr. Shapiro does not know them. He must have learned about the peasants' satisfaction with Agrarian Reform, of which he writes, witnessing a modest agricultural "show". But the real peasant, the one we Cubans know, finds, if he has been left with his land, that he has to apply to INRA for credit, as INRA sees fit to extend it to him. And he has only one buyer for his produce: INRA. In my coffee-producing region, the coffee grower previously had several buyers getting the best price for his product and enjoying independence. They bought his crop on his farm and paid for it where, when and how he wanted. Today, he has to sell to INRA without bargaining, being required to go several times to the city where INRA offices are generally located to get paid whatever they are willing to pay him. Sometimes they pay him in cash, but most of the time he is paid in vouchers he has to spend at "People's Stores," INRA property. Today there are no free men in rural Cuba.

The idyllic cooperatives that Mr. Shapiro mentions are, like those in China, Russia and any communist country, open to the "fellow traveler" or "objective tourist" to stimulate his enthusiasm and soothe his conscience. Cooperative militiamen showed pacifist Mr. Shapiro old pistols and 1903 Springfields, but their spokesman Fidel Castro has displayed rockets, tanks, artillery and automatic weapons in huge quantities and approximately 300 millions pesos worth of such arms have been poured into Cuba in the last year and a half. That whole arsenal was acquired by the man who one day in January 1959 publicly stated: "Arms, what for?" The picture of industrialization is so erroneous that propagandist Mr. Shapiro cannot mention a single industry founded in a year and a half.

VIII

Mr. Shapiro states that Cuban officials no longer make luxurious trips to New York and Miami, returning in

expensive American cars. Of course not, they now prefer to go to Prague, Moscow and Peking (which is farther and costs more) and purchase everything they can, though hardly automobiles, because communist production is not geared for such luxuries. But the most lavish American cars in Cuba are today being used by officials of the *Fidelista* "New Class".

Mr. Shapiro is ecstatic about progress in education and the conversion of barracks into schools. But what does he think about the deserted universities, with their professors in exile, in prison or underground and their students fighting heroically in the countryside or engaged in the secret battle of the cities or being murdered by Fidel, like the President of the University Student Federation of Las Villas, Porfirio Ramírez? Or did he only converse with foreign "fellow travelers" who today hold Cuban university chairs or with the prominent hand-picked communist university professors? And as for the conversion of barracks into schools, hasn't Mr. Shapiro seen the militarized children and adolescents marching to the chant of "Uno-dos-tres-cuatro-viva-Fidel-Castro-Ruz", (One-two-three-four-long-live-Fidel-Castro-Ruz)? But we suspect that the freedom of others is not something over which Mr. Shapiro is overly enthusiastic.

Mr. Shapiro portrays to us soldiers building houses and engaging in public works. But what about the militia? Or is it only a matter of terminology, for if we call a soldier a militiaman, does he stop being a soldier? Today Cuba is militarized, like never before in its history. Fidel Castro wants to convert an anti-militarist people like ours into a militarist people. It is not in vain that Sr. Castro never takes off his military uniform and even went to the U.N. wearing it.

IX

Mr. Shapiro tells us that Castro's opponents are war criminals or persons economically affected by revolutionary measures. Doesn't Mr. Shapiro believe that men in the past and in the present, inside and outside Cuba and in these United States, are capable of giving their lives to defend spiritual values? How many have died for their faith throughout the world? How many for freedom? Naturally, the communists do not believe this is so, according to their doctrine. They claim that economic consider-

ations account for men's struggles. But in our Cuban fatherland the glorious men of our great War of Independence of 1868 included rich men and even millionaires in large numbers and they gave their lives and their fortunes for something that cannot be evaluated in terms of money: for freedom. And in the struggle against Batista, Cubans fought, died and suffered for freedom. Because we Cubans do not know how to live without freedom.

Our ideal is not the beehive, let alone the fortress.

Mr. Shapiro claims that the Cuban revolutionaries of today are unwilling to run the risks that Castro and his men ran in the struggle against Batista. But Mr. Shapiro should know that the risks are now incomparably greater. Batista was a schoolboy beside Castro. The best fighters in the struggle against Batista are now opposing Castro. Frank País, who was sent to his death in Santiago de Cuba by Fidel, fearful of his essential Christianity, ran much greater risks than Fidel, Raúl and Ché, and so did the heroic men of the underground struggle in the cities. The communists did not risk their skins. They rarely do so. Mr. Shapiro will soon see. Previously, the revolutionary did not have to fear, in general, for his family. Sr. Manuel Bisbé, for example, Castro's representative at the U.N., collected during Batista's time his fat salary as a "retired Congressman" in the United States, while "he was plotting revolution." Minister of Economy, Dr. Regino E. Botí and Dr. Baudilio Castellanos, President of INIT and hundreds of others, likewise collected their university salaries. Castro's family suffered neither hunger nor threats. And it is not to be forgotten that after the attack on Moncada Barracks and their conviction, Sr. Castro and his brother Raúl were granted amnesty.

Today things are different. From the outset, since January 1959, there have been shootings without trial. Thousands of Cubans are in jail, some for two years now without trial. Torture is the order of the day. And as an innovation, being unable to stop the right of asylum, the properties of political refugees and opponents of the regime are confiscated, condemning their families to poverty.

Previously, the revolutionary knew that his family could go on living with whatever he left. Today everything is taken away. And close relatives are taken as hostages. Mr. Shapiro has not tried to imagine the cruelty that implies. We who have fought both revolutions know that this time

it is much worse than before. The Batista supporter was still a Cuban and he could be moved by Cuban sentiment. The *Fidelista* is not Cuban. The symbol is Ché and the thousands of Chinese, Koreans, Czechs and Russians we now meet in Cuba, but Mr. Shapiro has not faced them.

X

Mr. Shapiros innuendoes are also evidenced when he mentions the Church in a paragraph where, without saying so openly, he insinuates that the opposition of the Catholic Church is due in large part to the Spanish and pro-Franco clergy, or when he intimates that there was no decent press in Cuba and therefore nothing is lost without freedom of the press.

As for the Catholic Church, the Church knows very well that communism is "intrinsically perverse". The hierarchy and Catholic organizations and publications gave their full support to Fidel Castro and their world-wide campaign is responsible to a considerable extent for the fact that people throughout the world pictured Castro as a non-communist devoted to the good of his people and concerned with the humble. But as Castro's conduct evidenced his communist affiliation and his attacks on the faith and liberties became bolder, Catholic laymen and the hierarchy had to take up the defense of Christian principles and human rights. And thousands of our brothers are heroically offering themselves up to martyrdom, which may not matter to Mr. Shapiro, but does matter to Christians throughout the world.

As for the Cuban press, echoing Castro's lies based on half-truths, Mr. Shapiro states that the Cuban press in the time of Batista was bought and did not attack the dictatorship, although he also points out that Batista established press censorship. This is contradictory, for if it were bought, there would be no need for press censorship. The existence of censorship proves that the Cuban press, in spite of the financial aid most of it (though not all) has received for a long time from different Cuban Governments and institutions, expressed independent opinions. This is further proven by the fact that some of Fidel Castro's revolutionary ministers were selected from among Havana newspaper columnists (whom Shapiro describes as "subsidized"), like Dr. Rufio López Fresquet, Treasury Minister and columnist of "Diario de la Marina", and Dr. Cepero

Bonilla, Minister of Commerce and "Prensa Libre" columnist.

The assertion that the Cuban press early in Castro's regime was freer than ever before is erroneous. Prior to Batista, it was perfectly free. But since the early days of Castro there has not been complete freedom. Castro withheld the famous press subsidy checks to which Shapiro refers, thereby attempting "to blackmail" the press and limit exercise of its freedom. Hidden fear existed even during the celebrations held for several days after Batista's fall. It is not in vain that 600 men are executed. Shapiro's assertion that no Cuban newspaper publisher combatted Batista's dictatorship is another falsehood. One is astonished to see a history professor of this American democracy defend the Castro policy of death to freedom of the press.

Mr. Shapiro must have good reason to give assurances in his second article that he favors freedom of the press, but his article in the New Republic is worded to give the reader the impression that freedom of the press was not worthwhile in Cuba, because there was no true and decent press. Hence, nothing has been lost with Castro's attitude.

XI

The answer to Shapiro's statement implying that elections are unnecessary for Cubans is given in our foregoing remarks on Haselden's article. We wish only to add that the assertion to the effect that Castro's rallies bring out more people than voters in Cuban elections is false. And it is to be noted that the percentage of voters in Cuba prior to the coup d'etat of March 10, 1952, was greater than that of American voters in the presidential elections of this country.

XII

When he comes to the accusations of communism hurled at Fidel Castro's regime, the history professor of Michigan State becomes indignant. He is indignant because the ignorant do not distinguish a special, sterile and non-communist "Left" from communism and confuse close terms that should be differentiated. Columbia professor C. Wright Mills feels the same way. But the fact is that the ineffable Mr. Shapiro does not, for example, regard Tito's regime as "communist", but calls it "leftist-nationalist-neutralist", even though Mr. Tito understands that he and his followers are communists and the most genuine

Leninists and his party is called the League of Communists. Naturally, on that level one simply cannot understand. Mr. Shapiro calls regimes by the names that he likes best. But that does not change the essence of those regimes.

We have pointed out elsewhere that since the 20th and 21st Congresses of the Russian Communist Party (is it really communist, Mr. Shapiro?) the acceptance of different paths to socialism reduces the standard of orthodoxy and endorsement by the Russian party to the international position of the neophyte. If that position is correct, in the sense of promoting "peaceful coexistence" and voting with the Soviet Union, it is acceptable. Specifically, the accusation of "heresy" directed against Tito was based on the international policy of Tito during the Stalinist period more than on the doctrinal differences indicated in intellectual polemics. Recently in the U.N. Yugoslavia has shown a perfect understanding and comprehension of peaceful coexistence. The "path of Cuba" is therefore a communist path perfectly consistent with Soviet philosophy. So it has been, although, of course, Cuba is marching toward socialism prior to communism.

The only political party that exists in Cuba is the Popular Socialist (Communist) Party. Anticommunism is considered synonymous with counterrevolution. It is absolutely forbidden to be anticommunist. It is not true, as Mr. Shapiro claims, that genuine Cuban Bolsheviks speak of Fidel as a "fuzzy-minded idealist who will never understand what revolution is." At the National Plenary Sessions of the Popular Socialist Party held in July 1960, attended by the most distinguished international communists for the first time in the Americas, Secretary General Blas Roca made his self-criticism before Fidel, indicating that the Party had erred in 1953 in condemning the attack on Moncada and that Fidel with his sound revolutionary instinct laid down the correct tactical line. The predominant nucleus of the 26th of July Movement has from the start been the Leninist nucleus: Fidel, Raúl and Ché. (Incidentally, Mr. Shapiro speaks of the "bombardment" of Havana, Fidel's notorious international lie, but, as usual, it cannot be stated that Mr. Shapiro affirms the bombardment to be true; he simply mentions it.)

Mr. Shapiro's assertion that Fidel and the Cuban revolutionary leaders are not communists does not surprise us, considering that he does not regard Tito as a communist. Though we do not profess to be experts in history, we do know the Cuban situation better than Mr. Shapiro and

have been familiar with communist thought and action for many years and to us the communist character of the regime and its chief leaders is evident. If General Cabell, whom Mr. Shapiro quotes, did not seem to think so, then he was poorly informed. It is to be recalled that in the United States the veteran Chinese communist leader Mao Tse Tung was described as an "agrarian reformer."

XIII

The fact that traditional national values rather than communist values are today cultivated in Cuba is also erroneous. National holidays (of course, Mr. Shapiro does not know what they are) have been replaced by new *Fidelista* holidays. And reading is being taught on the basis of defication of Fidel, Raúl and Che. If Mr. Shapiro had leafed through any work of José Martí, the Cuban national hero, he would know why *Fidelismo* cannot use him as a basis for learning. Martí was the most "counterrevolutionary" writer there could be from the *Fidelista* standpoint, because he was a man of love and not of hatred, an impassioned defender of the liberty and dignity of man. And as for the lessons from the New Testament that he attributes to *Fidelismo*, we believe that Mr. Shapiro is not an assiduous reader of the Holy Scriptures either.

It seems to us that the statement to the effect that there were no executions in 1960 can no longer be repeated. Nevertheless, in his second article in December, after numerous executions in Las Villas, Pinar del Rio, Havana and Oriente, including that of student leader Porfirio Ramírez, the Michigan State history professor remains uninformed, just as he is unaware of how closely guarded Fidel is and of the careful scrutiny to which the Cuban population is subjected.

XIV

When he attempts to answer certain statements by Adolph Berle Jr. which displease him, he asserts that Latin Americans are now bored with talk about Hungary. He must be referring to communist Latin Americans who do not like the subject and with whom, it seems, Professor Shapiro has met. Because we other Latin Americans do remember Hungary. Any lover of freedom personally deplores the lack of freedom of others. But there are those who love dictatorship, at least if it is of the "leftist" variety.

They are the ones, according to Aron, who smoke the modern opium of communist revolution. And for them, there is no freedom other than that of communist power. They defend university autonomy and faculty freedom in democracies. But they thoroughly suppress them in a well-oriented "leftist" dictatorship aiming toward socialism.

XV

Mr. Shapiro states that Castro has denied that there are going to be Soviet bases in Cuba. For Mr. Shapiro that is sufficient. The basis of his reasoning seems to be that Fidel Castro does not lie. But if Mr. Shapiro reads what Fidel Castro originally wrote in "History Will Absolve Me," the facts he signed with other revolutionary groups, the interview published in the February 1958 issue of Coronet and his first speeches, he will see that everything Castro said has remained unfulfilled. Hence, Sr. Castro's affirmation that there will be no Soviet bases in Cuba is meaningless. We feel the same way about Mr. Khrushchev's statements. If the Soviet Premier's declarations were to inspire Mr. Shapiro with full faith and confidence, this is something that might impress the Russians, but cannot be reasonable to an American.

No great power in the history of the world has had the generous and disinterested attitude of the United States toward the Soviet Union. To many that policy has been a major historical error. We have seen the Russian answer in the last 15 years. With a monopoly of atomic power, with the unexploited possibility of making its extraordinary aid to the Soviets in the struggle against Hitler subject to certain conditions and with its invitation to Stalin to participate in the war against Japan at the last minute, the United States, which could have readily guaranteed truly democratic and pro-Western Governments in Eastern Europe and throughout the world, played the game of proving to the U.S.S.R. that it had nothing to fear from the United States and the West by handing over to it the portion of the world that Russia deemed necessary for its security. The result has been the unending expansion of the Soviet sphere of influence, Russia not having let up for one moment in its worldwide campaign of defamation against the United States. Many Americans accuse their own country of being warlike, while applauding the "pacifism" of the U.S.S.R., whereas the historical record of both

CHAPTER FIVE

I

nations proves just the contrary. Soviet official philosophy recognizes war with the noncommunist world as something inevitable. In practice, communist totalitarianism cannot coexist without an iron or bamboo curtain with the democratic countries, because it cannot accept criticism, or even dissenting opinion, and the mere existence of a democratic state constitutes a living criticism of communism. This country may often be weakened by the malicious criticism of many of its own citizens, but it is built to withstand such criticism. Communist totalitarianism cannot do that. We are still waiting to see a "progressive" professor engage in a real, systematic and long campaign designed to persuade the communist countries to permit freedom of thought and of the press and to allow all ideas to be disseminated, defended and challenged without fear. When that is possible throughout the world, peaceful coexistence will be a fact. But as long as that is not the case, the peaceful coexistence predicated by the "peaceful" Mr. Khrushchev constitutes simply another weapon in the struggle within the democracies against the democracies, the "show" very often being run by supposed democrats who, deliberately or irresponsibly, lend themselves to serve as instruments for the destruction of freedom throughout the world.

We Cubans who are fighting the communist dictatorship of Fidel Castro had occasion to realize once again the pressing need to salvage the truth about the Cuban situation, after reading a chapter from the book by Columbia University Sociology Professor C. Wright Mills entitled "Listen, Yankee" reprinted in the December 1960 issue of Harper's Magazine. This is not an isolated instance. Together with the recent book by economist Paul Sweezy, frequent visitor to the Cuban communist regime and supporter of same, and L. Huberman and the chapter from Professor Mills' book, we also read other articles. When one adds to this the television program "Yanki, No," produced by Time, Inc., which had the effect on Cuban exile viewers of an invitation to return to paradise, there is evidenced the existence of a current of "understanding toward Castro" that flows within a broader stream of thought regarding the communist peril wherein Stalinism tends to be regarded as a now-cured disease of Leninist communism and Khrushchev and his communist followers, including Castro, are therefore seen as men of peace, desiring to dedicate themselves to the large-scale production of consumer goods in their respective countries in order to raise the living standards of their inhabitants.

II

It is to be emphasized that the "cold war" is fundamentally a war of ideas and propaganda and only secondarily an economic war. It has not been on the military front where the Soviets have evidenced superiority, but on the ideological and propaganda front. What we might consider the philosophy or "concept of the world" most frequently implicit in American behavior predisposes the "Yankee" to giving exaggerated importance to the economic aspect of problems and to underemphasizing ideas and the social spheres where ideas are produced: universities, schools, academies, scientific publications, etc. When the United States granted substantial aid to Europe under the Marshall Plan, the American criterion of providing economic resources was the correct one, since European culture is on a high level, and as far as theoretical and

practical knowledge of Marxism-Leninism is concerned, Europe reached maturity some time ago. But in the case of aid to our Latin America or to Asia, Africa and the countries of the Pacific, the equation is different and it must be borne in mind that the economic aspect cannot be the sole consideration, since it is not true, as is so widely believed, especially in intellectual circles, that because of poverty and so-called under-development communism has opportunities to triumph in those regions, but rather that such opportunities for political success are due to its uninterrupted emphasis on ideological dissemination and indoctrination, massive and untiring propaganda and its penetration and infiltration of existing social structures: Churches, universities, teaching profession, journalism, judiciary, etc. The case of Cuba and of dictator Fidel Castro is a good demonstration of this thesis. Only those who substitute their prejudices for truth and inform themselves, by means of the profuse literature of the communists and fellow travelers, of facts of which they are ignorant can assert that the communism of Cuba met a need presented by the social and economic situation prevailing at the time of its triumph. But let us restrict ourselves to comments on Professor Mills' chapter in Harper's.

III

With its usual concern about informing the American public and its customary objectivity, so characteristic of the press of this country despite the assertions of Castro-ist communism to the contrary, Harper's Magazine presents the chapter from Professor C. Wright Mills' book. First of all, we wish to state, in answer to Harper's concern about "understanding the revolutionary impetus that brought Castro to power," that such impetus was that of a classic revolution against tyranny and for freedom. The most widely disseminated pronouncements of Fidel Castro and the thinking of the men and women of the Revolution, notably of the heroic dead like Frank País and José Antonio Echevarría, have nothing in common with what Castro has done since he came to power. The communist Cuba that has been taking shape since January 1, 1959 has not been imposed by pressure from the great majorities, but is the product of the deliberate action of a bold and unscrupulous minority headed by the Dictator himself. The problems that foreign intellectuals, ignorant of Cuban history and of the current situation there, believe the Castro regime

is trying to solve with its communist and communistic measures were created since the rise to power as justification for the totalitarian dictatorship systematically implanted by Castro. It is evident that in fifteen days of study, however intense, it is impossible to become thoroughly familiar with a complex social phenomenon like the communist revolution in Cuba.

A specialist in the study of the structure and working of minorities acting in Public Power, as Professor C. Wright Mills is undoubtedly, should have been able to realize the excellent game played by the Cuban communist minority, justly proud of its great success and so justly congratulated and appreciated by the hierarchy of international communism. Fidel Castro presents the novelty of being the only head of a communist regime that began his administration with extraordinary popularity, namely, because the Cubans did not know him as a communist and believed him to be Cuban. Hence, as Professor Wright Mills should have been able to realize in his intense study of the Cuban revolution, the initial techniques of Fidel Castro have been reminiscent of Nazism, a form of totalitarianism also born out of popularity: uniforms, parades, patriotic hymns, People's Assembly, personal responsibility of the leaders instead of the rule of law (*führerprinzip*), etc. But as Fidel Castro revealed his true personality and evidenced the communist alignment of his regime and his anti-Cubanism, his popularity has been disappearing, in spite of the unprecedented action of the greatest propaganda machine the Americas have ever known. Today, with barely 20% of the population on his side, Castro's communist totalitarianism is a police state; from a smiling people to a somber people; that is the Cuba of today. It is therefore remarkable that Professor Wright Mills, who visited Cuba in August 1960, did not see, with his perceptiveness as a sociologist, the truth. He must have been wearing strange glasses.

IV

In his introduction to the chapter of his book reprinted by Harper's, Professor C. Wright Mills maintains that the "voice of Cuba" is the "voice of the bloc of hungry nations." Here now the Marxist-like differentiation of nations into hungry proletarian nations and self-satisfied wealthy bourgeois nations is evident. Hence, it is only

one step from the Marxist "class struggle" (two classes) to the struggle of blocs of nations (two types of nations). Furthermore, even assuming there were a "bloc of hungry nations" as a premise for analyzing Wright Mill's assertions about Cuba, the statement that the voice of Dictator Fidel Castro is the voice of Cuba lacks the slightest scientific validity. Why does the distinguished sociologist believe that the voice of Castro is the voice of my country? Is it because it is the voice of the Government? In that case, to Professor Wright Mills the voice of Dictator Batista was the voice of Cuba in his time, and the unpopularity of the previous tyrant cannot even be denied by the Columbia professor. Is it because the Professor believes that Fidel Castro represents the majority of the people of Cuba? On what does he base this? What is the picture in my country? A single authorized and working political party with newspapers, radio stations, business premises, vehicles, the Popular Socialist Party (Communist). All media of communication directly controlled by the Government by means of confiscation, expropriation and intervention. The faculties of the official universities politically purged to the extent that barely 10% retain their chairs. The student body persecuted and heroically fighting in the fields and underground. University chairs filled by members of the Popular Socialist Party and communist militiamen substituting for the absent students. Professional associations with their headquarters "taken over militarily" by the communist militias and their Boards of Directors deposed, a tremendous number of professional men having to go into exile because of the physical impossibility of living in Cuba.

In the field of labor the leaders who defeated the communists last year with the free votes of the Cuban proletariat are still in jail or underground or in exile. In Cuba today the workers are directly under the thumb of the Minister of Labor, "Comrade" Martínez Sánchez, Major of the Rebel Army, and in my Province of Oriente the old communist leader, Juan Taquechel, after 16 years of being kept out of power in the unions by choice of the workers, has emerged as master of the proletariat of Oriente backed by the Czech machine guns of Fidel. Among the peasantry, a class which many foreign "intellectuals" gratuitously assume to be represented by Fidel Castro, the unpopularity of the regime is intense. In my own Province of Oriente, aside from the many "insurrectionists" who are

aided and abetted by those supposedly communist peasants, the regime has imprisoned and holds without trial hundreds of representatives of the peasants out of fear that they will form the nuclei of future uprisings that might some day be properly armed.

Fidel has had to revive his institution of the firing squad and has planted in Cuba and even abroad a huge political police force. In a recent speech he officially advocated informing as a civic duty. All of that is evidence of an unpopular dictatorship. Why then is the communist voice of Fidel Castro regarded by Professor Wright Mills as the voice of Cuba? There is no direct proof by means of elections and no scientific basis for presuming same either. The opinion that the voice of Castro is the voice of Cuba and also that of the "bloc of hungry nations," an opinion which in Professor Wright Mills' case is the result of a very intense though brief study conducted by him notwithstanding his ignorance of the language, coincides with communist official opinion and is the same opinion disseminated by the communist propaganda machine. If during his intense study Professor Wright Mills had read the very interesting speeches delivered by the leaders of the Cuban Popular Socialist Party (Communist) at its plenary assembly of July 1960, he would have noted that the old program was changed and adapted to the new times, in accordance with the guidance of Premier Khrushchev at the 21st Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, coinciding with the "path of Cuba." At that plenary assembly of the Popular Socialist Party and as proof that the communists consider Cuba a Soviet country, the leading international communists were present for the first time in the history of the Americas, including a figure very well known for his extraordinary activities in the field of doctrinal and strategic discipline of international communism, Jacques Duclos.

V

Professor C. Wright Mills believes, and many intellectuals agree with him, that the "voice of the Cuban Revolution," that is, the voice of Castro-ist communism, has not been heard in the United States. That assertion is astonishing, because after weapons, on which almost 300 million pesos have been spent, the other great expenditure of the *Fidelista* regime has been propaganda. Outstanding figures

from abroad, from Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir to Paul Baran and Pablo Neruda, and hundreds of journalists, writers and artists have been invited, feted and paid by Castro-ist communism. Motion picture directors of world renown, like the Italian Cesare Zavattini, were hired to make revolutionary propaganda films. Magazines like that of INRA (National Institute of Agrarian Reform), published without heed to cost and on a par with the well-known propaganda publication of the communist world, circulate everywhere. Fidel Castro's recent show in New York and in the United Nations was a piece of propaganda for "his Revolution." In Europe the influential magazine *Esprit* and *Les Temps Modernes*, in addition to innumerable periodicals of France, Italy and other countries of the Continent, have been publishing articles in defense of Castro-ist communism.

Early Catholic propaganda helped create the image of the "Catholic" Fidel which many people still have in Latin America. All of that was the result of the generous, optimistic and uncritical propaganda of those who, without being communists, gave unlimited credit to Fidel in the early stages. At the inception of his Government, Fidel Castro traveled to the United States, invited by the press before which he spoke in New York and at Harvard, and he journeyed through South America. And all of that was propaganda. From the outset he set the stage for the so-called "Operation Truth" (*Pravda* in Russian) to prove that in Cuba men were executed after fair trial, while the truth is that Raúl Castro shot more than seventy persons in a single day without trial in the city of Santiago de Cuba. Certainly one thing that has been in excess supply in Fidel Castro's regime is propaganda. All of the foregoing does not take into account the impartial persons who go to Cuba at their own expense and after intense study concur with the regime's propaganda machine.

Professor Wright Mills states, agreeing with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, that the ignorance about Cuba is due to the fact that there is no information agency for foreign newspapermen in Cuba. He must be unaware of the creation by Fidel Castro of the "Prensa Latina" agency, supported with the aid of international communism and in charge of preparing Latin American news for world consumption and of better adapting for Latin American tastes the news propaganda plates of the Soviet agencies, Tass, New China, etc.

The Columbia professor maintains that to evaluate Fidel Castro's revolution, it is necessary to know somewhat in detail "the great variety of leftist thought and action." The writer of this article has been interested since his student years in these subjects and has followed the evolution of those leftist ideas and actions for the last 25 years, further having had the opportunity to watch communist strategy at work in Europe and in Cuba from very close up, almost living the experiences of many friends who actively participated for long years in the communist movement. And he understands that precisely at this time, since the 20th and 21st Congresses of the Soviet Communist Party, the strategic and doctrinal freedom left to regional leaders is extraordinary, for the U.S.S.R. fundamentally applies international attitude as a criterion of orthodoxy. If the international attitude is correct, local interpretations are allowed with a latitude heretofore unknown in the world communist movement. Hence, the Cuban magazine "Fundamentos," doctrinal review of the Popular Socialist Party (Communist), the only party existing in Cuba, has developed in its latest issues the doctrine of initiation of the socialist stage through the peaceful conversion of a properly directed "nationalist and anti-imperialist revolution" into an openly communist revolution.

As Professor Wright Mills knows, in the march toward communism there are stages. Whereas the U.S.S.R. is now officially advancing towards the communist stage, in accordance with the program laid down by Lenin, Cuba is advancing toward the socialist stage at a velocity of the atomic era. And the Popular Socialist Party (Communist) has just drafted a program for that stage with the agreement of the Castro Government. One of the "novelties" of the Cuban situation, as compared to the U.S.S.R., Communist China and the countries of eastern Europe, is the great velocity of the process of socialization. That is, not only are there variations in the non-communist left, as Professor Wright Mills very well recalls, but there are variations within the communism internationally unified under the latest directive of the Russian party. The program of Tito's Communist League is communist. And the thinking and action of Gomulka are not identical to those of Khrushchev. Nor can it be said that the Chinese variant, because of the peculiar conditions of that enormous

country, is reflected in doctrine and strategy. But that whole panorama of different shade of color constitutes unity from the standpoint of the unending war against the West and democracy. The voices that Professor Wright Mills reflects say: "we ourselves do not quite know what to call what we are building, but that does not matter to us. Of course, its some form of socialism." It could be that the voices the Professor represents do not know, for lack of the necessary knowledge or of adequate vocabulary, what kind of revolution they are creating. But to those of us who have for a long time known communism, on the one hand, and Cuba and its history, on the other, it is crystal clear that communist totalitarianism is being built up in Cuba.

VII

A renowned French philosopher, Raymond Aron, in a recent celebrated book entitled "The Opium of the Intellectuals," speaks to us of a peculiarity of certain intellectuals of the West, impatient with the defects of democracy which they blow up under the pretext of scientific objectivity, and, on the other hand, extremely "understanding" of the inhumanities of communist totalitarianism, because it is "creating a new world" and is guided in the "direction of history." And we have often been able to verify the truth of Aron's statement. It is possible to diminish faith in democracy and respect for American democracy in particular by placing under the microscope structures that can be classified as oligarchical and it is thus possible to create the impression that in this country there is no true freedom nor is there adequate information and that a group of great magnates control everything. Such erroneous presentation of the United States and of the western world in general is made on the basis of half-truths. No one denies that men constituting minorities are always the leaders of great masses and that small, well organized and properly situated groups exert tremendous influence. But the difference between a democracy like the United States and a totalitarian dictatorship like the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics resides in the fact that in the long run the American people decides its own destiny at crucial times and minorities have to win over public opinion, even though they might help shape same. There is an open market for group competition. Here the common man has the word at great moments in history and can influence

his own future at any time. In the totalitarian Soviet Union a closed class, which tends to become a caste and cuts off all circulation from the bottom up, directs the masses without respecting the personal dignity of the common man. The American economic structure, preoccupied with individual comfort, and the Soviet, dedicated to power and dominion, are examples of two ways of life.

Professor C. Wright Mills is the author of a book of vast world circulation entitled "The Power Elite," a large number of copies of which is being sold in a very cheap edition in Cuba, widely distributed by the Communist regime of Fidel Castro. The reason is that that work, which is naturally scientific and objective, is being used by the *fidelistas* to bear out their point of view that the United States is not a true democracy, that democracy does not in fact exist and that it is therefore not worth while speaking about it. One of the "bêtes noires" of Fidel is representative democracy. In order not to forfeit the emotional charge and world prestige of the term "democracy," following the example of the communist countries, he has taken great pleasure in referring to his totalitarian dictatorship as "classic Greek style direct democracy." There in direct communion with the Leader in the public square, the people are liberated from the hideous pressure of the oligarchical groups. Adolf Hitler said the same thing.

VIII

The anti-American campaign of Castro's communist regime has not been a reaction against the hostile conduct of President Eisenhower's Administration. That statement is erroneous. From the outset, since January 1959, that campaign, carefully prepared beforehand, became clearly evident. In my Province of Oriente anti-American indoctrination began as early as January 1959 with mimeographed publications that the author of this article then had the opportunity to read, in which the history of relations between Cuba and the United States was distorted to foment anti-Yankeeism. A residue of that falsified history can be read in Professor C. Wright Mills' chapter, conveying the message of the Cuban revolutionaries.

IX

It is not worth the trouble for us to refer to the lines

of Professor Wright Mills chapter in which prostitution is depicted as a cause of revolution. That piece of literature reflect the influence of Castro's well-known propagandist Jean Paul Sartre, author of "The Wall" and "The Respectful Prostitute." "The Respectful Prostitute" was precisely the work selected by Fidel Castro's regime to open the season of the National Theater of Cuba.

X

Fidelista communism cannot complain about having encountered a lack of understanding in the American press, in spite of never-ending and unfair attacks on the United States and its press. A newspaper as important, influential and respected as "The New York Times" has always leaned over backwards as far as Castro's regime is concerned. The voices that Professor Wright Mills conveys, in an apparent hint at reconciliation, coinciding with the triumph of the "peaceful" policy of Khrushchev over the "warlike" policy of Mao, are now saying that excesses have been perpetrated against Cuba in the news and propaganda of the United States and that excesses against the United States have been committed in Cuba, postulating the need to seek an "impartial" halfway point. It is the old communist tactic, so convenient to fellow travelers of every latitude, of seeking compromises and neutrality on the basis of stands taken by the adversary. As there is freedom of the press in this country and in Cuba none, the possibility of presenting information on equal terms is unreal, since the only ones who can write and speak in Cuba are communists and their fellow travellers, while here the numerous friends and allies of communism can depict the Cuban hell as a veritable paradise through books, radio and television.

XI

The picture of a poverty-stricken, illiterate and dirty pre-Castro Cuba is erroneous. Until a short time ago, and Professor Wright Mills could have verified this in his intense study, Cuba had the highest standard of living of any country in the tropics. Fidel Castro himself, in numerous speeches that the Columbia professor should have read, has boasted of his feat of creating a revolution under conditions of economic prosperity in Cuba, as contrasted to the usual thesis that poverty generates revolutions. Life, of course, is change and movement and it is evident that

any "status quo" presents many aspects that ought to be altered. In Cuba, like everywhere else, such was the case. But the communist or communistic reforms that Fidel is implanting by force were never desired by the Cuban people. Prior to Batista, the two big Cuban parties were the Cuban Revolutionary Party (Auténtico), which was in power, and the Cuban People's Party (Ortodoxo), which was in the opposition. The Cuban proletariat and peasantry were almost entirely in the ranks of those two political organizations. The most ardent revolutionary desire was for administrative integrity. It is not that people did not want greater economic progress, better distribution of wealth, more social justice and fuller realization of the dignity of man, a concept so dear the heart of our José Martí, but all of that was sought and it was understood by almost everyone that it could be attained within the constitutional channels that had been freely laid out by the people of Cuba. It is by no means true, as we have so often read from pens ignorant of Cuban events, that the economic and social situation in pre-Castro Cuba is the *raison d'être* of the present communist regime. It was the armed will of steel and cunning of the group directing the revolution, a Leninist-trained group, which caused the Cuban revolution against Batista to follow the Communist path evident today. Blas Roca, the old and experienced general secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba (Communist), was therefore able to state at the closing session of the plenary assembly of his party held in July 1960 and to which we have already referred that communist objectives were being carried out under different names and that constituted "the astuteness of history, the astuteness of the people, the astuteness of the revolution." Indeed a cynical statement, but very Leninist.

Leninism is primarily a strategy for taking and preserving power; the party organization, the instrument of power, is its fundamental concept. Therefore, in the Russia of 1917, in the so-called pre-Mao "feudal China" and in countries where a numerous proletariat did not exist, but where there was a well organized Leninist party, leaders and propitious circumstances, communist victory has been gained. It has not been gained, on the other hand, in the United States, Germany, England, highly developed industrial countries with a numerous and alert proletariat, but where Leninist strategy has been in want of a sufficiently skilled party or of capable leaders or where the right cir-

cumstances have not been present. In Cuba it has not been "with" the proletariat and the peasantry, but supposedly "in the name" of those classes that the governing nucleus of communists and fellow travelling opportunists is implementing the vast transformation of Cuba on which it is embarked.

It is said that there was nothing in Cuba that was worth while. They want to create a new world and to build it, the Cubans are useless. That accounts for the haste of international communism in "decubanizing" Cuba at full speed. Since January 1, 1959 the traditional national holidays, the dates commemorating the founders of the nation, are no longer celebrated and have been replaced by new holidays, the holidays of the communist "new calendar."

And it is understandable. Cuban tradition is wholly contradictory to communism. We Cubans are affectionate, not hateful; we are men of "forgiveness," not of the "firing squad." Our greatest historical figure, José Martí, of whom Fidel Castro is the complete negation, preached war of independence without hatred of the enemy and he practiced it. And it is our pride to be able to show for the admiration of visitors on San Juan Hill, scene of a decisive battle of the Spanish-American War, a monument commemorating the dead of the three armies that fought there: the Mambí soldier, the American and the Spaniard against whom they fought. I do not believe many countries of the world have such monuments, but this serves to indicate to the American people that we Cubans bear no resentments nor rancor, but are generous and kindly. Communism must therefore erase our history, for it is not in accord with the scientific and systematic preaching of hatred as a motivating force in history, characteristic of communist thought and action. It must therefore also discredit our great historical figures and change our customs, making informing, which is regarded with utter contempt by Cubans, a virtue, changing everything in short. And that is why it is repeated a thousand times a day that nothing was of any value. Only with brainwashed automatons instead of Cubans, can the tragic triumvirate of Fidel, Raúl and Ché serve their Sino-Soviet masters.

XII

That the communist program existed from the start and the swindle of Fidel Castro, Latin-American televisions

greatest actor, was not the result of a subsequent change of mind are evident from the declarations of Professor José Miró Cardona, eminent Cuban jurist, Prime Minister of the revolutionary regime in January 1959, who delayed his official break with the communist government of Fidel Castro until a few months ago in an effort to salvage from shipwreck and treason everything possible of the principles in which the people of Cuba really believe. Professor Miró, regarding in retrospect the process of his own deception, courageously admits that he was wrong and it is evident, in the light of historical events, that the evolution of Fidel is not a product of chance or of reaction to foreign attitudes, but of conscious and deliberate planning.

XIII

The voices that Professor C. Wright Mills echoes say that the Cubans who speak for the people and claim they do not know where they are going are not "Stalinists." But neither is Mr. Khrushchev a Stalinist, which makes him no less communist. The whole tale of wonders achieved in agricultural production through the celebrated "agrarian reform," as well as in industry and trade, is a tissue of lies. There is not room enough in this article to refute item by item the delusions reproduced by Professor Wright Mills. But the only thing at which Castro's communists have proven to be first-rate is in the process of destruction of the national economy.

XIV

As for our sovereignty, Cuba has never been less sovereign than it is at present. When the United States purchased our sugar at prices well above world market prices, we were paid in dollars which we could spend anywhere. The reason why we Cubans preferred to buy in the United States is simply, as even the Russians admit, that this country is the world's leading industrial power and producer of goods in quantity and variety. And an elementary knowledge of geography teaches us that Cuban is only 90 miles off the coast of Florida. But in the present commercial dealings with Russia, our sugar is bought at a much lower price, only 20% being paid for in foreign exchange and the rest being received in Russian products not quoted on the world market, of poor quality and which we shall

have to accept at the price they set. It is extraordinary that it should be claimed, even by professors, that Russian trade makes us independent, while American trade enslaved us. All of that does not take into account the obligation to cooperate in international affairs in fabrication and dissemination of the rosy picture of "peaceful coexistence." Although in the last twenty years our balance of trade with the United States has been unfavorable to us, in the previous forty it was favorable. This means that if the fact that the balance is favorable to the United States is a sign of imperialism, the United States was not imperialistic from 1900 to 1940. A curious conclusion.

XV

The reliable Cuban sources that Professor C. Wright Mills claims to cite dogmatically assert that revolution in our time is a product of poverty, a concept widely disseminated in American intellectual circles. But contemporary history teaches us that the outbreak and triumph of a communist revolution do not depend upon poverty: they are the product of organized action to take power. Lenin's victory over Kerensky in Russia was not due to the majority will of the Russian Proletariat and peasantry, but to the organization of the Bolshevik Party and to the action of leaders like Lenin and Trotsky. The communist triumph in East Germany, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Albania and even Yugoslavia (not to mention the extinct Baltic states) has one simple and irrefutable explanation: the presence of Russian bayonets. The majority will of the proletariat and peasantry was hostile, as it still is fifteen years later. Mao Tse-Tung's triumph in China was a military victory, the product primarily of the blindness of the West which permitted Stalin to be one of the victors over Japan at the last minute and the arms of the Japanese Army in Manchuria to fall into the hands of the communists, giving them a decisive military potential, without overlooking the fact that aid was finally withdrawn from the Chinese Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-Shek to the advantage of Mao, described by American "specialists" as an "agrarian reformer" in a feudal country, but in no sense a Soviet-style communist, just as our dictator Fidel Castro is regarded by other American "specialists" as also an "agrarian reformer," gentle and pastoral. A Soviet regime has never sprung from the majority will of the supposedly or really oppressed.

In Cuba, as in Latin America in general, economic and social conditions, when unhealthy and demanding change, have given rise to popular parties that can on the whole vaguely be considered "leftist," but are by no means communist. In Cuba the parties "of the masses," were the Cuban Revolutionary Party (Auténtico) and the Cuban People's Party (Orthodoxo). Fidel Castro was initially popular because he was not known to be a communist and was believed to be a democrat and a nationalist. But as soon as he began to act like a communist, in spite of his extraordinary capacity for deceit, he began to alienate the majority will of the people of Cuba, not only of the moneyed professional or middle classes, but also of the proletariat and peasantry.

XVI

The ideological and propaganda struggle between the West, chiefly the United States, and the Soviet world is very unequal. First of all, the only scene for that struggle is the West and the countries outside the Soviet orbit. In other words, there is none but the slightest chance of bringing the truth to those who live under Communist regimes. It all boils down to a struggle to defend ourselves against lies. The foreign books that circulate in the Soviet world are those that are useful for detracting from the values and prestige of the western world. Here, on the other hand, books attacking western oligarchical structures are offset by other works which put things in their right place and by the democratic way of life of men and women of the west. Those disparaging books in the Soviet world, where there is no democratic way of life and where works presenting the other side of the picture do not circulate, are used to corroborate the propaganda fed to their citizens by totalitarian regimes.

The existence and spread of hatred of the United States throughout the world is easily explainable when one takes into account that it is a product of an old, systematic and relentlessly applied plan of the communists. Since 1917, since that very Red Dawn, Lenin and the communist hierarchy knew that the ultimate enemy would be the United States, since it was known even then that the great democratic and "capitalistic" country would have an undeniable future of world influence. At no time, not even when this generous country rescued the Soviet Union from

the threat of Hitler, did the anti-American campaign cease. They are now reaping the fruits of forty years of persistent planting. This is not surprising. In regions of the globe, for example, that Professor Wright Mills refers to as the "hungry nations," where living standards are far below those of this country, the United States represents the greatest source of wealth. Conditions therefore exist which predispose people toward anti-American bias, through no fault of the United States. But Soviet propaganda exploits those conditions and creates a picture of American "culpability" which curiously enough is even disseminated in this very country. And when something has to be invented, they go right ahead.

XVII

Among us we have been witnesses to a colossal lie in the best communist tradition: the bombardment of Havana. As is known, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Cuba went so far as to publish an illustrated pamphlet of the "bombardment." Of course, "history" was fabricated to create the impression of American irresponsibility and build up anti-Yankee hatred, and the pamphlet was circulated throughout the world under the auspices of the Soviet propaganda machine. The millions of people living behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains today firmly believe the story about the bombardment, because they have no other information, and it is obvious that their attitude toward the United States in particular and the West in general has to be influenced by the sort of news they get. Does Professor Wright Mills seriously believe that it is possible to coexist under those conditions? Furthermore, the power of massive propaganda is such that I have met people in Havana itself who "believe" in the bombardment. They begin by claiming that they virtually witnessed it and end up, when pressed a little with detailed questions, by admitting that although they might not have seen it personally, they know "reliable" persons who witnessed it. Professor C. Wright Mills can be sure that at this moment millions of people in Africa, Asia, Indonesia and Latin-America believe the story about said bombardment, which is very readily understandable according to the popularized picture of the United States, depicted as a gigantic and cruel imperialist country violating the most elementary

standards of law and humanity against a small neighboring nation because of the simple fact that the "popular revolutionary government" of that small nation wishes to improve the miserable lot of its oppressed people. It might even be, if Professor C. Wright Mills conducted his study of Cuba on the basis of printed matter, as is only proper for a professor following objective scientific methods, that he too believes, by virtue of the innumerable articles that have appeared in every language and of actual photographs, in the historical truth of the "bombardment" of Havana, an event described by Fidel Castro at that time as "our Pearl Harbor."

XVIII

It is good for Americans to be well informed and always to know the truth. But it is very harmful, under the pretext of telling them the truth, to try to convince them of facts that do not exist. When one reads books and articles in specialized periodicals in which previous American foreign policy is described, not with a historical criterion but with contemporary appraisals, one gets the impression that that policy has been guided by a perverse and calculating will and that the United States is a monster. And that is false. To describe an event of 1898 in terms of 1960 is rather unscientific. The fact that the United States granted independence to Cuba in 1902, but added the Platt Amendment, makes it possible to stigmatize the United States in 1960 as "imperialistic." On the other hand, the recent subjugation of millions of people by Soviet force, occurring at the same time as and in sharp contrast to the gradual liquidation of western colonialism, does not serve to describe Russia as "imperialistic."

We, the democrats of Latin-America are very well aware of the fact that the guarantee of continuing to remain free and to think and speak without hypocrisy (as our José Martí defined freedom) is afforded us by the power of the United States. We know that everything tending to weaken the United States weakens freedom throughout the world. We believe that the most dangerous foes of this great nation are to be found from within. It is necessary to be very alert. Communism does not fight face to face, but infiltrates and creeps in through its numerous fifth columns. The case of Cuba, communized against the will

of its people through the treason of a small group controlling the arms and the propaganda is, we repeat, an example.

It is necessary to regain freedom and democracy for the world. And it is necessary to begin with Cuba. That is why we are in full accord with the concluding sentences of Professor C. Wright Mills:

What does Cuba Mean?

It means another chance for you.

Beware, Yankee!

The following statement has been issued by the Faculty and Students of the University of Oriente, at Santiago de Cuba, as a result of a recent referendum that took place in the month of November 1960. This statement has reached us through the underground channels. The University of Oriente, is one of the three Cuban officials universities.

STATEMENT OF THE FACULTY AND STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ORIENTE

The majority of the members of the faculty and student body of the University of Oriente (Cuba), confronted by the present Cuban political situation, which insofar as the University is concerned represents a shameful betrayal of a traditional struggle for freedom, of which Cuban university students and professors are justly proud, and evading the obstacles that the present totalitarian regime of Fidel Castro imposes on all matters of collective conscience and on all freedom of expression, make public the following statement, representative of the opinions and the true feelings of our University, which is in fact misrepresented by a spurious official administration that the terror and machine guns of Fidel communism have placed at its head.

The University of Oriente feels that it is obligated to issue this statement, since this university has been the very center of the glorious struggle of November 30th, 1956 and a strong bulwark in the fight against Batista's tyranny since March 10th, 1952. We summarize the statement in the following points:

- 1) In the realm of domestic politics we condemn Fidel Castro as a traitor to the Revolution that this University helped to organize and to win. Since the very day of March 10th, 1952 this University made public by all means available a statement of its opposition to Batista's coup d'état and affirmed that it would not cease in its struggle until freedom and constitutional order were restored in Cuba. Those objectives of complete freedom, human rights and constitutional order, crystallized in the 26th of July Movement, have been crushed by the Castro regime in open treason to the memory of our martyrs Frank País, Pepito Tey, Eduardo Mesa and many others.
- 2) Also in the realm of domestic politics we declare that Fidel Castro has betrayed José Martí and the best Cuban traditions, substituting the preaching of hate and rancour for the traditional ones of love and concord; that Fidel has been branded with the indelible mark of fratricide by his cowardly assassination of Porfirio Ramírez, President of the Federation of Students of the Central University of

Miami, December 8, 1960.

Las Villas; and lastly, that the communist regime of the supreme traitor is engaged in a systematic downgrading of great Cuban patriots in order to exalt further certain foreign leaders whom the press and other news media display as munificent saviors of mankind in general and of the Cubans in particular.

3) In the realm of economics we express the conviction that the complete ruin of the Cuban economy has been purposely sought by the communist leadership, cognizant of the fact that the Cuban people will overthrow the Soviet dictatorship of Castro, and desirous of leaving Cuba in the worst possible situation, contemptuous of the fate and welfare of our children, our women and our population in general.

4) In the realm of international politics we repudiate the shameful alliance with the murderers of Hungarian, German and Polish students and professors, as well as of countless other victims of Soviet imperialism; we repudiate the alliance with the relentless persecutors of every independent student movement, with the banner bearers of a new slavery for the world, and we state that such an alliance with the Soviet bloc represents an infamous betrayal of the heroic Cuban university tradition.

5) In the realm of university life, we declare Fidel Castro a traitor to the autonomy of the university, defended to the death by a legion of student martyrs, from Trejo to Ramírez and José A. Hechevarría. We denounce publicly the suppression of academic freedom and freedom of thought, the establishment of marxist-leninist indoctrination centers within the Cuban universities, sponsored by the Communist government of Fidel, and the existence of only one authorized political party: the Popular Socialist Party (Communist); and lastly we denounce the systematic subordination of the aims of scientific investigation within the universities to the aims of consolidating and maintaining in power the totalitarian tyranny of Castro.

6) We declare that the faculty and students of the University of Oriente who have collaborated with the supreme traitor will give account of their conduct on the day of liberation.

7) In conclusion, we express our firm conviction that the year 1961 will see Cuba free from the communist tyranny of Fidel Castro and, in order to accelerate the process, the faculty and students of the University of Oriente reiterate their pledge of March 10th, 1952 not to cease in the fight until the overthrowal of the infamous regime of treason and fraud, and the establishment of a climate of freedom, respect for human rights and constitutional life.

Santiago de Cuba, December, 1960

Fermin Peinado, former Dean of the Law School of the University of Oriente, knows his Cuban politics. He is a Professor of Political Theory and has a vast knowledge of the political problems of Cuba.

"Beware, Yankee" is a collection of articles aimed at those Americans that "beholdest the mote" in the Democracies' eye but don't "considerest the beam" in the Communist's eye.

The author points out:

- The error of stating that the Castro revolution "is not communist" but "leftist nationalism"
 - The error of stating that Castro's anti-Americanism "reflects a spontaneous state of mind of the Cuban people"
 - The error of pretending that the Cuban economy has developed favorably under the Communist regime
 - The error of stating that the suppression of human liberties and rights is compensated by the betterment of the humble classes.
-

Professor Peinado opposed Batista's dictatorship from its very beginning, having been designated to be the speaker to publicly express the Oriente's University repulse to the "coup d'état" of March 10th, 1952. Consistent with his democratic principles, he refused to accept Castro's totalitarian communism and ruthless suppression of the traditional liberties of the Cuban Universities. As a consequence he had to leave Cuba.

S.P.